

Strictly personal and confidential.

24/11/89

490, Ian Stewart-Brady,  
Park Lane Hospital,  
Liverpool L31 1HW.

Dear Mr Pittaway,

Thank you for your letter of 22<sup>nd</sup> Nov 89 and the tape of the Topping interview with Bob Azurdia. Please compliment Mr Azurdia on the tenacious way he tore at Topping re his reasons for writing his book and the amount of money he was/is to be paid by the publishers and the Sun. I'm surprised that Mr Azurdia missed the opportunity — when Topping tried to justify his financial gain by stating he had spent 12 months writing the book — to point out that it was ghost-written for him by "Sun" hackette Jean Ritchie, who previously exploited the case by writing "Inside the Mind of a Murderess" about Myra Hindley. A question that should have been put is: "How much are you being paid and how much is Jean Ritchie being paid for ghost-writing your book?" This would give the total sum of money tied up in the deal. His refusal to divulge the money he is receiving speaks for itself and exposes his tosh about the "public interest" for what it is. Honest mercenaries are so much more palatable than hypocritical ones.

A point Topping failed to mention when he accused me



2  
of "keeping secrets," was that I told him right from the start that I did not intend to discuss the cases or conduct public-relations exercises to please the Home Office or the Parole Board; my sole aim and function was to locate sites as quickly as possible. And when he offered to let me know what Myra Hindley's version of events were, I stopped him after less than thirty seconds, which was the time it took to reach the first lie, and said, "That's sufficient. I now know her angle."

Although Topping, in his book, expresses doubts as to the veracity of her "confessions" and describes them as "good performances," this did not stop him, his publishers and the Sun from claiming, for financial exploitation, that they had the "true story" re the Moors Murders, and printing details they knew would cause distress to relatives of the victims. Mr Azurdia mirrored this point.

Documents which my solicitor holds will prove beyond the slightest doubt that Myra Hindley's "confessions" are false. Her statement to the Home Office and the Parole Board, 30,000 words long claiming total innocence — prior to my re-opening the case — she admitted to Topping was "a pack of lies." Yet Topping did not hesitate to sell her fresh pack for a fortune. At a future date he will be made to look a mercenary clown



by documentary evidence, not circumstantial or hearsay.

As to the consequences of his mercenary actions. It is grotesque for him to expect anyone to submit to experiments in hypnosis, or anything else concerning the Manchester Police. I personally shall never deal with them again at any level. The two murders I told them of committed in Manchester — the man on the wasteground behind the station and the woman in the canal, which I detailed to Topping — he said a mentally retarded man had confessed to the first but was not charged; and that the second had been treated as suicide, though there was no note. This, in police parlance, is known as "fitting up or clearing the books." Therefore my statements were an embarrassment to the police, who, rather than admit irregularities had taken place will move mountains to cover-up. Perhaps by Topping's Masonic friends.

As for Keith Bennett. The area of the site is in Yorkshire, not Lancashire, and should have been dealt with by the Yorkshire Police.

I have already stated my readiness to questioning under Sodium Penthatol (so-called "truth drug") but not by the Manchester police. Unlike Myra Hindley's



alleged willingness to be hypnotised — which she knew the Home Office would not agree to, I am in a more pragmatic situation — I am a patient, not a prisoner, and am resident in a hospital with the proper facilities and supervision for such an operation.

I only saw Topping curiously agitated on three occasions — (a) when I wrote direct to the Scottish police re cars up there; (B.) when I suggested that, rather than fritter around with Topping's small team, a hundred or more policemen should be brought in to achieve speedy results; (C) when I pointed out that the search area for Keith Bennett was/is in Yorkshire and should be dealt with by the Yorkshire Police.

All three of these observations and suggestions have a common factor: they would involve the participation of other police chiefs. This would present a direct threat to the "exclusive" deal with Topping's publishers and the Sun.

Re Topping's relationship with Mrs West. She asked if she could visit me and I agreed. But the visit was stopped by Topping on the grounds that it would "impede investigations" and that Mrs West was a woman who thrived on publicity and kept "a video



library of all her T.V. appearances." I informed M<sup>rs</sup> West of these comments.

As for Topping's alleged neck injury as the reason for his early retirement. At no time did he refer to this or display any signs of such an injury. And when I heard of his plans to retire early, my previous experience of mercenary police chiefs prompted me to inquire whether he was doing so to cash in by writing a book. This he firmly denied.

As stated in previous letters to you, I have already drafted a lengthy statement re Topping and Myra Hindley ready for distribution in the media, but am holding back until Topping faces the three writs in court. Therefore I stress to you that the strict confidentiality of this letter must not be broken — a senior officer in the police, having no confidence in Topping, has been funneling inside information to me through a third party. Any breach of confidentiality will jeopardise future cooperation with police outside that of Manchester (already excluded) and the reason publicly aired.

This letter is by way of a quid pro quo re the tape you sent. You now have prior information of which way the wind will blow. The only other person privy to this knowledge is a friend of mine and a B.B.C. colleague of



6  
yours, Peter Gould.

I look forward to receiving the taped copy of your station's interview with M<sup>rs</sup> West, as promised.

Either by design or accident, the Topping tape you sent contained an unbroadcast continuation of the interview, up to M<sup>r</sup> Azurdia referring to the murder of a man on a train from Scotland. It breaks off at the point of M<sup>r</sup> Azurdia saying: "But not on a train?" And Topping saying: "I've not, I've not..."

I would like to hear the remainder of that unbroadcast material.

Re Topping asserting that I'd given no details of the other spontaneous murders, or "happenings". A lie. I gave him details including names, places and methods used. As an example (easily checked by you, but not until Topping faces the writs), I wrote a statement four pages of foolscap in length to the Strathclyde Police, re the murder in Glasgow and the second above Loch Long. The absurd responses from Topping to this was — (a) re the man in Glasgow: "Records don't go back that far"; (b) re the man above Loch Long: "There is no record of a missing person." If you check with the Home Office, you will find that an average of 20,000 people a year go missing in Britain. Therefore, I believe that Topping, by


P.T.O.



making such absurd statements, was concerned only in keeping other police chiefs at bay and protecting his "exclusive" deal with his publishers and the "Sun."

A final request. I have kept a draft copy of this letter to you, but I request that you forward a photocopy of it to my solicitor. There are photocopying facilities in the hospital but not direct access. In short, I do not wish any third party to read this letter and thus break the security precautions I have taken re confidentiality.

My solicitor is :-



I would like you to post the photocopy of this letter to him by recorded-delivery.

Sincerely,

P. Brady

P.S.: Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and requests in it without mentioning details.